REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are now pending in this application. Applicants have cancelled non-elected claims 18-31 without prejudice and with the right to file a divisional application at a later date to pursue these now-cancelled claims. Claim 17 has also been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of these claims in light of the analysis of the prior art below.

I. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowability of claims 7-11 over the prior art.

Claims 1-5, 12-14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/02698. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. WO'698 discloses a method for treating an underground reservoir with a treatment fluid consisting of an ester and a non-enzyme catalyst capable of increasing the rate of hydrolysis of the ester, such that the ester hydrolyzes to produce an organic acid. WO'698 fails to teach or suggest a method for improving the permeability of a well using a well treatment fluid consisting of water, a buffer, and hydrogen peroxide or per-acid as required by claim 1 of the present invention. Even considering the hydrolysis of the disclosed esters, WO'698 only discloses the formation of organic acids and not hydrogen peroxide or per-acid as claimed.

Claims 1-5, 12-15, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 85/04213. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. WO'213 discloses the use of an aqueous solution of hydrogen peroxide for the purpose of restoring permeability in a wellbore. WO'213 clearly fails to teach or suggest a well treatment fluid consisting of hydrogen peroxide or per-acid with a buffer, as required by claim 1 of the present invention. In fact, WO'213 at page 5 teaches away from the use of a buffer by stating that "hydrogen peroxide solution can be injected into the wellbore without adjusting the pH of the solution away from its normal value."

Claims 1-6, 12, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,069,286. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The '286 patent discloses the remediation of water wells using a polymeric sequestrant with a biocide (such as glutaraldehyde) to kill bacteria that produces slime and foul the well. The '286 patent fails to teach or suggest a method for improving the permeability of a well using a well treatment fluid

consisting of water, a buffer, and hydrogen peroxide or per-acid as required by claim 1 of the present invention.

Claims 1-6, 12, 14, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,818,594. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The '594 patent discloses the use of inactivated or encapsulated enzymes to break down polymer cakes in wells. The '594 patent fails to teach or suggest a method for improving the permeability of a well using a well treatment fluid consisting of water, a buffer, and hydrogen peroxide or peracid as required by claim 1 of the present invention.

In light of the above analysis of the prior art, Applicants respectfully request that independent claims 1, as well as dependent claims 2-16 be reconsidered.

* * * * *

Applicants believe that the present pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of the pending claims in light of the above analysis of the prior art.

* * * * *

In order to facilitate the resolution of any questions presented by this paper, Applicants request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned attorney by telephone at 713-787-1496 to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey J. Phillips 4 Reg. No. 51,125

Customer No. 23369

ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE, BJ SERVICES COMPANY

Howrey LLP 2941 Fairview Park Drive, Box 7 Falls Church, VA 22042 Phone: (713) 787-1558

Fax: (703) 336-6950

March 20.2006